

RSN Economic Profiling Service

Introduction

The RSN has developed an economic profiling service for its members. Information will be provided based on the indicators and to the frequency set out in the table below. In addition to straightforward data two spreadsheet benchmarking tools have been developed for Notified Vacancies, JSA claimants at LEP level and the Vulnerability Index.

Indicator	Frequency
Wages – Annual Survey Hours and Earnings – resident analysis	Annually
Job Density	Annually
Notified Vacancies	Quarterly
JSA Claimants at LEP and local authority level	Quarterly
Proportion of Public Sector Jobs	Annual
Working Age Population	Quarterly
Out-turn forms – showing spend on ED benchmarking	Annual
Vulnerability Index	Annually

All the statistics are taken from publicly available data sources. We have attached a commentary for the first two data areas released: Notified Vacancies and the Vulnerability index below.

The other data sets are currently being prepared and will be released on each local authority page over the next 8 weeks.

If you would like further information on this service or help to interpret it for your area, including potential access to GIS mapping support in relation to it please contact Ivan Annibal at:

Ivan.Annibal@sparse.gov.uk

Vulnerability Index Results for 2012

Summary

According to the RSN 2012 rural vulnerability index rural authorities became relatively more vulnerable in 2012 than 2011. At District level coastal rural authorities have suffered particularly badly and 5 of the 10 most vulnerable authorities are now both coastal and rural. At first tier level 7 of the 24 rural authorities studied for the index are in the top 25% of all authorities including London Boroughs and the most vulnerable is Northumberland which is the 16th most vulnerable authority in England in 2016.

The Vulnerability Index

The Vulnerability Index was developed in response to the challenge of measuring the impact of the recession on local authority areas. Traditional measures of need such as the Index of Multiple Deprivation concentrate on current circumstances. In view of the deep seated and long term changes, which are likely to change the current configuration of long term prosperity and sustainability in English Communities, the RSN identified the need to develop an index of vulnerability to change, to sit alongside more traditional measures of need.

The index identified vulnerability by looking at:

Wage levels, the current stock of public sector jobs, the number of JSA claimants and the percentage of the population which is working age. You can access a more detailed note explaining why these indicators were chosen and the data sources used.

Our index is simple and easily understood. The spreadsheet which accompanies this narrative allows you to compare your authority against all other authorities and benchmark its relative vulnerability within key categories of authorities – such for example as other districts in a given county and all other predominantly rural authorities. You simply need to click on the drop down menu at the side of the local authority name displayed in the spreadsheet and choose your authority to generate a listing of your relative vulnerability.

2012 Results

This is the second year of our development of the index and comparing the relative position of authorities between the two indexes provides some interesting context for authorities thinking about the impact of the recession in their area.

At first tier level the top 10 most vulnerable authorities in 2011 and 2012 were as set out in the table below:

Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012
Blackpool	Blackpool
Sefton	Torbay
Torbay	Sefton
Wolverhampton	Wolverhampton
NE Lincs	Darlington
Southend	Middlesbrough

Darlington	Wirral
Wirral	Blackburn
Middlesbrough	Dudley
Doncaster	Stoke

The most vulnerable RSN member authority in both years was Northumberland which was 21st in the index in 2011 and in 2012 is 16th.

Whilst none of these authorities are RSN members a number have key service centre roles for rural communities – particularly Torbay, Darlington and North East Lincolnshire.

At district level a number of RSN member authorities are in the top 10 of the most vulnerable authorities:

Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012
Thanet	Thanet
Hastings	Boston*
Boston*	Eastbourne
Scarborough*	North Devon*
Shepway*	Hastings
Eastbourne	Waveney*
Great Yarmouth	Tendring*
Weymouth and Portland	Weymouth and Portland
Tendring*	Wyre
Worthing	Shepway*

Interestingly 4 of the most vulnerable authorities within the top 10 were RSN members in 2011 and in 2012 the figure has risen to 5, with North Devon moving from the 12th most vulnerable district in 2011 to the 4th in 2012. This change appears to have been driven by a significant increase in JSA claimants, from a very low base of 159th out of 201 to 99th out of 201.

All of the authorities in the top 10 over both years which are RSN members are also coastal and in a number of these authorities such as Tendring and Boston their economic vulnerability is further challenged by their vulnerability to flood risk.

Key sub-regional service centre towns within a number of these authorities such as Boston, Clacton, Lowestoft, Scarborough, Folkestone and Barnstaple give them a disproportionate dependence on public sector jobs.

At first tier level the relative position of RSN member authorities was as follows:

Authority	Ranking 2011	Ranking 2012	Change
Cambridgeshire	144	115	-29
Cheshire East	83	90	+7
Cheshire West and Chester	79	60	-19
County Durham	51	52	+1
Cornwall	37	26	-11
Cumbria	74	47	-27
Devon	42	33	-9
Dorset	40	34	-6
East Riding	56	43	-13
Hampshire	120	120	0
Herefordshire	44	39	-5
Isle of Wight	14	18	+4
Lincolnshire	32	26	-6
Norfolk	45	47	+2
North Lincolnshire	56	77	+21
North Somerset	97	108	+11
North Yorkshire	74	79	+5
Northumberland	21	16	-5
Oxfordshire	119	118	-1
Rutland	85	50	-35
Shropshire	27	25	-2
Somerset	39	45	+6
Suffolk	58	63	+5
Wiltshire	70	80	+10

In 2011 5 RSN authorities were in the worst 25% of authorities on the list: Cornwall, Isle of Wight, Lincolnshire and Northumberland and Shropshire. In 2012 this has risen to 7: Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Isle of Wight, Lincolnshire, Northumberland and Shropshire. Apart from the Isle of Wight all the other authorities in 2012 had become relatively more vulnerable than in 2011.

Overall 13 authorities became relatively more vulnerable whilst 10 became relatively less vulnerable and one (Hampshire) retained its previous ranking.

Significant increases in relative vulnerability (10 places or more) occurred in: Cambridgeshire, Cheshire West and Chester, Cornwall, Cumbria, East Riding and Rutland. Overall the level of relative decline for first tier RSN authorities which slipped down the list were higher than the levels of relative improvement for first tier RSN authorities which rose up the list.

Northumberland continues to be the most vulnerable RSN authority and Hampshire the least vulnerable.

Notified Vacancies as a percentage of Working Population

Introduction

One powerful and easy way of looking at fluctuations within economies at local authority level is to consider trends around the number of jobs advertised. This information is available through the Office of National Statistics. Trends in notified vacancies run around three months in advance of up or down turns in local economies more generally and using this information you can develop inferences about the direction of travel of your economy.

As part the RSN profiling service we have systemised and benchmarked information on the number of notified vacancies for our members. The spreadsheet which accompanies this note shows the performance of all authorities in quartiles. By clicking on the drop down box you can see the quartile trend for your authority. You can also compare how it performs against categories of authorities by using the drop down box immediately below – you can select the District average or the average for authorities in the rural 50 and rural 80 categories.

We will update this information on a quarterly basis and produce a commentary on trends.

Starting Commentary

Looking at the last 18 months from January 2011 to the end of August 2012 and using an average figure for the number of notified vacancies as a % of the working population we can identify the following 10 authorities as the best performing

North Warwickshire Borough Council	Rural-50 Average	2.61%
Daventry District Council	Rural-80 Average	2.55%
Corby Borough Council	Other Urban	2.27%
Exeter City Council	Other Urban	2.24%
East Staffordshire Borough Council	Significant Rural	2.02%
Lichfield District Council	Rural-50 Average	2.00%
Lincoln City Council	Other Urban	1.99%
North West Leicestershire District Council	Rural-50 Average	1.98%
Tamworth Borough Council	Other Urban	1.89%
Crawley Borough Council	Other Urban	1.89%

The astonishing thing about the best 10 performers is that 7 of them lie in a south west midlands cluster in adjoining counties of Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Northamptonshire and Leicestershire with their main urban centres no more than 30 miles from each other. 4 of these authorities are predominantly rural (North Warwickshire, Daventry, Lichfield and North West Leicestershire. The list also contains two “shire” cities of importance to a large rural hinterland: Exeter and Lincoln.

The following authorities are the 10 worst performing. Whilst 6 authorities are urban in context 4 are interestingly in the rural 80 average and the very worst performing two authority areas (Copeland and Forest of Dean) are both rural 80 authorities. Unlike the top 10 performing areas there is no significant geographical contiguity in the worst performing areas.

Castle Point Borough Council	Large Urban	0.60%
	Rural-80	
Wealden District Council	Average	0.60%
Adur District Council	Large Urban	0.60%
Three Rivers District Council	Major Urban	0.59%
	Rural-80	
Torridge District Council	Average	0.58%
Gosport Borough Council	Large Urban	0.56%
Gedling Borough Council	Large Urban	0.56%
Oadby and Wigston Borough Council	Large Urban	0.55%
	Rural-80	
Copeland Borough Council	Average	0.50%
	Rural-80	
Forest of Dean District Council	Average	0.43%

Overall the predominantly rural authorities as a group performed considerably less well than other authorities – creating notified vacancies at 0.89% of their working population. Non predominantly rural authorities achieved a figure of 1.14%. With significantly larger working populations this demonstrates that the vast majority of new jobs over the last 18months have been in urban authorities.

The best 10 performing predominantly rural authority areas compared to the best 10 non rural areas are show below:

Top 10 Urban			Top 10 Rural		
Corby Borough Council	Other Urban	2.27%	North Warwickshire Borough Council	Rural-50 Average	2.61%
Exeter City Council	Other Urban	2.24%	Daventry District Council	Rural-80 Average	2.55%
Lincoln City Council	Other Urban	1.99%	Lichfield District Council	Rural-50 Average	2.00%
Tamworth Borough Council	Other Urban	1.89%	North West Leicestershire District Council	Rural-50 Average	1.98%
Crawley Borough Council	Other Urban	1.89%	Newark and Sherwood District Council	Rural-50 Average	1.84%
Preston City Council	Large Urban	1.83%	West Lancashire Borough Council	Rural-50 Average	1.76%
Cambridge City Council	Other Urban	1.83%	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	Rural-80 Average	1.71%
Worcester City Council	Other Urban	1.82%	Wychavon District Council	Rural-80 Average	1.63%
Northampton Borough Council	Other Urban	1.77%	Harborough District Council	Rural-80 Average	1.55%
Oxford City Council	Other Urban	1.63%	Test Valley Borough Council	Rural-50 Average	1.50%

The worst 10 performing predominantly rural areas compared to the worst 10 non rural areas are shown below:

Thanet District Council	Other Urban	0.65%	West Devon Borough Council*	Rural-80 Average	0.66%
Gravesham Borough Council	Major Urban	0.61%	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council*	Rural-50 Average	0.66%
Rochford District Council	Large Urban	0.61%	High Peak Borough Council	Rural-50 Average	0.65%
Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council	Other Urban	0.60%	Allerdale Borough Council	Rural-80 Average	0.63%
Castle Point Borough Council	Large Urban	0.60%	Dover District Council	Rural-50 Average	0.61%
Adur District Council	Large Urban	0.60%	Rother District Council	Rural-50 Average	0.61%
Three Rivers District Council	Major Urban	0.59%	Wealden District Council	Rural-80 Average	0.60%
Gosport Borough Council	Large Urban	0.56%	Torridge District Council	Rural-80 Average	0.58%
Gedling Borough Council	Large Urban	0.56%	Copeland Borough Council	Rural-80 Average	0.50%
Oadby and Wigston Borough Council	Large Urban	0.55%	Forest of Dean District Council	Rural-80 Average	0.43%

* equal 9th from bottom with Maldon and S Northants Councils